
MINUTES

Educational Policy and Programs Committee

Meeting of June 12, 2000

Committee members present Carol Chandler, *Chair*
Lance Izumi
Kyo “Paul” Jhin
Velma Montoya
Andrea Rich
Roger Schrimp
Howard Welinsky
Guillermo Rodriguez, *ex officio*
Alan S. Arkatov, *ex officio*

Committee member absent Monica Lozano, *Vice Chair*

Other Commissioners present
Jeff Marston
Ralph Pesqueira
Kyhl Smeby
Melinda G. Wilson

Call to order Committee Chair Chandler called the June 12, meeting of Educational Policy and Programs Committee to order at 9:30 a.m. in the California Chamber of Commerce, California Room, Esquire Plaza, 1215 K Street, 14th Floor, Sacramento, California.

Approval of the minutes Chair Chandler asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the committee’s April 3, 2000 meeting. It was so moved and the committee voted without dissent to approve the minutes as submitted.

A snapshot of the community college transfer function in 2000 Committee Chair Chandler said the topic of community college transfer is vital and called upon staff member Cheryl Hickey for her report.

Ms. Hickey said the Commission had received a staff presentation on selected community college transfers at it last meeting. As a result, she staff had developed six key policy questions on transfer and had asked the segments to respond to these questions. Ms. Hickey reviewed the trends present in materials staff had provided in the agenda. She said upper division student transfers are increasing, but there is a significant drop off in the transfer of lower-division students. She said enrollment information for fall 1999 now shows a slight increase in the overall number community college transfers over the prior fall. She said it remains to be seen if the rise will hold up over the entire academic year.

Ms. Hickey reported that there is a new MOU between the community colleges and the CSU that sets ambitious goals for student transfers between those institutions. As a

result, each higher education system now has a transfer MOU with the community colleges. Additionally, she said, the governor's new compact with UC and CSU features a significant student transfer component.

Ms. Hickey introduced the segmental representatives on hand to discuss student transfer issues. They were Christopher Cabaldon, Vice Chancellor of Policy, Planning and External Affairs for the California Community Colleges, Juan Yniguez, AICCU Vice President for Research and Information Services, Nancy Scroddy, Associate Director of Enrollment Management Services for the California State University, and Dennis Galligani, Vice President of Student Academic Services of the University of California Office of the President.

Chair Chandler asked the representatives to discuss their respective transfer policies.

Mr. Cabaldon led off, noting that the majority of community college students (some 60 percent) do not have transfer to a four-year institution as an educational goal. Nevertheless, he said the transfer function is part of community colleges' central mission. He said the California Master Plan for Higher Education assumes a seamless transfer process that still does exist. The transfer process still contains a measure of risk and the ability to do so successfully is not guaranteed, regardless of academic performance. The community colleges have taken steps to smooth out the process, such as establishing articulation agreements with other institutions, development of the transfer associate degree, and faculty articulation agreements. He said there had been a three-year decline in transfers, but that there is a relationship between economic conditions and transfers. Therefore, it is important to consider longer-term results and prospects. He said there is a need for better data collection to be sure transfer students are being served. He announced that the community colleges have entered ambitious transfer agreements with UC, CSU, and the AICCU.

Mr. Cabaldon and several commissioners discussed various aspects of the transfer process, during which the following were among the points made:

- ◆ There are several steps in the transfer process that make it a complicated progress;
- ◆ Community colleges have made good progress in terms of general education articulation for transfer students, but more work is needed to improve preparation in major courses of study;
- ◆ Community college transfer centers can help students make contact with four-campuses; and
- ◆ Not all community college campuses have transfer centers, but many more have opened recently and more will open, pending additional funding.

Director Fox said the Commission had expressed its concern, as recently as the *Policy for Progress* report this year, and urged the community colleges to be more specific in defining what constitutes a "transfer eligible" student. He noted that the Community College Board of Governors had recently addressed this issue.

Mr. Cabaldon said the board had said the community colleges should, if there is not agreement on this point among the segments, seek legislation to set such a definition. He said significant internal progress has been made among the community colleges, but the goal is to have a definition that is directly related to admissions. He said reaching such a standard is in the best interest of students and would increase accountability of the systems.

Mr. Galligani said that an implementation committee for the UC/CCC transfer MOU had reached a definition of transfer-eligible for UC. Commissioner Pesqueira said a poster with CSU system-wide transfer eligibility requirements had been widely distributed.

Ms. Scroddy reported that 75 percent of all California Community College transfer students move on to a CSU campus. She said overall CCC/CSU transfers are down. However, she said most of the decline has been in number of lower-division students who transfer. Upper-division transfers are increasing. She said this is explained by the fact that the State Education Code requires that the highest priority be assigned to upper-division transfer students, individual CSU campuses having the latitude, in order to manage their respective enrollments, to not accept lower-division transfers. Additionally, she said, some community college students have delayed transferring pending completion of the CSU-required general education courses (three in English and one mathematics). Ms. Scroddy said CSU believes overall transfers will rise. She cited the facts that transfer application to CSU are up significantly, and that CSU has a new transfer MOU with the community colleges.

Director Fox asked about the discretion of individual CSU campuses to limit enrollment of lower-division transfer students. Ms. Scroddy the highest priority for enrollment is given to upper-division transfers, second priority goes to first-time freshmen, and last consideration is given to lower-division transfer students. Therefore, campuses facing enrollment limitations, employ policies that limit or exclude lower-division transfers. The rationale is that lower-division students can continue their education at the community college level.

Commissioner Pesqueira noted that students who were CSU-eligible before enrolling at a community college have a better chance of transferring as a lower-division student.

Commissioner Jhin asked for a definition of a lower-division student. Ms. Scroddy said CSU defines an upper-division student as one who has completed 56 or more transferable semester- or 84 or more transferable quarter-units. This generally includes 30 units of general education units and the CSU-required courses in English (3) and mathematics (1).

Chair Chandler said that acceptance of completion of a CCC degree as automatic CSU eligibility is a laudable goal. She called upon UC.

Mr. Galligani passed out a packet of material to the commissioners. He said nearly 90 percent of the students who transfer from a community college to a UC achieve their eligibility at the CCC-level. The University believes that transfer numbers will improve. He cited the CCC/UC MOU goals and that there are now more on-campus UC trans-

fer centers. He said that 79 percent of the transfer students achieve a baccalaureate degree within four years of enrollment at a UC. He agreed with Mr. Cabaldon that it is not known that all transfer students are not already being served and that data collection needs improvement.

Director Fox said he is impressed by the number of transfer students who persist to degree at UC and he asked if the University knew why the number is increasing. Mr. Galligani cited two reasons: (1) improved preparation at community colleges; and (2) better and more attention paid to students once they transfer to a UC campus. He said students who survive their initial period at UC most often persist to degree. He also said the University's share of transfer students is up significantly (18 percent now vs. 13 percent a decade ago).

Several commissioners, Mr. Galligani, and others discussed various other aspects of transfer students, including the fact that there are few CSU/UC transfers, most UC transfer students attend full time; many CSU upper division students, which includes many transfer students, attend part-time.

Mr. Yniguez, reporting for the independent college and university sector, said independent institutions in California collectively enroll annually some 20,000 transfer students, of which about 12,000 are from California Community Colleges. He said there is room to expand the number of community colleges transfers to independent colleges and universities. He reported on the new MOU the sector has with community colleges on student transfers. The goal is to increase transfer to 15,000 (using 10,000 as a base). He said AICCU is using its leadership to encourage its members and the respective presidents to work toward improved CCC transfers.

Director Fox asked what could be done to improve data the Commission has on transfer students in the independent institutions. Commissioner Montoya asked about tuition costs at independent institutions and whether this is a factor in admitting transfer students.

Mr. Yniguez said work is being done to both define transfer-ready students and to improve the manner in which independent institutions will report such admission and enrollment data. He said independent institutions' tuition cost averages about \$15,500 per year and that most transfer students would likely need to receive financial aid in order to attend an independent college or university. He said some 70 percent of the students at independent schools receive aid and that the average student aid "package" was close to the full tuition cost.

Ms. Hickey said the Commission staff is working with institutions to increase the amount of Website-based reporting that can be done in order to improve the process for administrators and to improve the quality of such reporting.

There was a general discussion around the question, raised by Commissioner Arkatov, as to whether institutions have done or will be doing qualitative research about the student transfer process. He said the utilization of focus groups and tools would enable better marketing of the community college transfer opportunity. In response, a number of points were made, including the following:

- ♦ Independent institutions will be doing some research around this issue;
- ♦ The community colleges do receive some antidotal evidence about the transfer process;
- ♦ Informal student feedback is somewhat useful, but better data are needed to improve an understanding of who does and who does not use the student transfer process to prepare for a baccalaureate degree; and
- ♦ There may be a large as-yet untapped potential for community college transfer if perceptions about the process can be changed.

A general discussion followed a comment and question by Commission Chair Rodriguez. He said the new transfer memorandums of understanding are evidence that progress is being made. This is a good first step. He said that leads to questions about what steps are next in order to make them successes. Among the points made were the following:

- ♦ It is vital to improve joint faculty efforts among and between the institutions, particularly involving major preparation, and, utilizing Project Assist data, UC has number of such initiatives underway;
- ♦ Chancellor Reed has challenged the CSU campuses to identify a core of major preparation courses and to get that information to students, likely using the World Wide Web;
- ♦ Students must receive transfer information early in their education process in order to better plan how to meet the transfer-process requirements;
- ♦ A “baccalaureate-plan” student aid package for potential transfer students might improve the numbers of those who use the transfer option in seeking a four-year degree;
- ♦ Some students may be staying longer in the community college process in order to complete their degrees; and
- ♦ That many are optimistic that the community colleges transfer numbers will rebound and improve.

Commissioner Rodriguez expressed frustration with the pace of current efforts to improve course articulation. He asked what incentives might exist for faculty to establish articulation agreements. He said the data suggest that a limited number of community college campuses are “feeder” schools in the transfer process. He asked what efforts are being made, or whether or not the new memorandums, acknowledge this fact and whether there will be any effort to include a wider range of institutions in the transfer process. The responses included the following:

- ♦ More community colleges should and will be included in the transfer preparation process, particularly those that serve educationally disadvantaged populations;
- ♦ Regional higher education consortia that engage faculty are working on transfer; and
- ♦ More is being learned about students who may want to utilize or who might benefit from the transfer process in order to reach those students.

Mr. Cabaldon commented that the community colleges have found that campuses with high rates of transfer to a four-year institution have a large percentage of students under age 25, are in close proximity to a CSU campus, have a low percentage of students receiving financial aid, and have a high percentage who have transfer as an educational goal. He said the focus for improving transfer rates will be campuses that have unrealized potential.

Commissioner Izumi asked how the transfer process affects campuses that may be impacted already.

Ms. Scroddy said that, in order to accommodate some 130,000 more students by 2010, the CSU must use year-round schedules, off-campus centers and other innovations.

In response to Commissioner Wilson's inquiry about efforts to reach current high school graduates, several initiatives were discussed, including better counseling efforts and improved information dissemination.

Commissioner Marston asked about the statistics that have been reportedly recently about the large percentage of community college students who do not transfer. He asked why, given the fact reported earlier in the meeting by Mr. Cabaldon, that the vast majority of community college students do not have transfer as an education goal.

Mr. Cabaldon said part of the problem are data that are self-reported by community college students upon enrollment. These data give an erroneous picture of the number of students who actually comprise the pool of potential transfer students. He said efforts are underway to better define and identify those students who are working toward a transfer goal.

Commissioner Arkatov said some research shows that student expectations are the determining factor in whether or not an individual eventually transfers to a four-year program from a community college. Responding, Mr. Galligani and others cited as important factors, early identification of potential transfer students, providing counseling on-line, getting students on campus early, providing support for programs that are underway; and getting a general message out about the overall importance of higher education.

Mr. Cabaldon said transfer-bound and job skill-development groups are distinct and that it is important to take care not to give the message that those who do not go on to a four-year program are somehow less important; he said specific job and workforce training are also critical to the economy and in other ways.

Commissioner Arkatov said that, given the 60/40 ration of the community college student body of students who do not have transfer as a goal compared to those who do, he is bothered that the numbers of actual transfer are so low. He said it appears that most who do have transfer as a goal are not having their expectations met.

Commission Chair Rodriguez referred to the list of questions posed by the Commission about transfer and reiterated the question about how transfer fits into the systems' strat-

egies for accommodating the tidal wave of expected student demand. Among the responses were:

- ♦ Community colleges will play a critical role in meeting this need;
- ♦ The University of California will utilize off-campus facilities and distributed learning centers;
- ♦ CSU will expand its operational flexibility such as using year-round operation, and distance learning; and
- ♦ That the focus at CSU will be on local students.

Director Fox asked about the effect on out-of-area students who are seeking a specific CSU program. Ms. Scrodde said program impact is different and that most campuses will, in the foreseeable future, continue to have some room for non-local students on this basis.

Commissioner Pesqueira said GPA would play a key role in admission of out-of-area students. He said it is not likely that the State will build more full campus facilities and he expressed concern about the current financing process for alternate facilities such as off-campus centers. Additionally, he said, CSU and others are helping raise the quality and perhaps quantity of high school graduates, and that this may have an impact on higher education enrollment. For example, fewer students may want to attend a community college first because they are better prepared to proceed directly to a four-year institution. He said the Commission has a role in helping communicate this information to the Legislature and others.

Mr. Yniguez said that there are differing views on what impact outreach, other student-preparation programs, and education reforms may have on enrollments. One view is that there will be a large increase in applications from increasingly better-prepared students who want to go straight to baccalaureate-degree institutions. He said this could, without paying it special attention, have an adverse effect on student diversity in higher education.

There was an extension of the discussion about what percent of community college students have a transfer goal and what percentage eventually enrolls at a four-year institution. There was general agreement that about one-third of those students who may have transfer as a goal do so, and that more needs to be known about why students do or do not enter the transfer process.

Committee Chair Chandler thanked all participants and asked staff to provide a similar update on student transfer issues in 2001.

Recess Committee Chair Chandler recessed the meeting at 11:50 a.m.

Reconvene Commissioner Chandler reconvened the meeting at 2:40 p.m.

**Student friendly
services**

Commissioner Chandler called upon Deputy Director David Leveille to introduce the guests who would make a presentation on the student friendly services project. Mr. Leveille introduced Frank Tansey of the CSU Sonoma campus, and Ron Fox from the State Department of Education. He said Mr. Tansey is the project coordinator and that Mr. Fox is the department of education's representative on the project committee.

Mr. Leveille said the goal of the Student Friendly Services project is to provide students and their families with information about attending college in California. He said it is a collaborative partnership among California colleges and universities and was initiated by the California Education Roundtable, which includes the Commission. He said the Roundtable's intersegmental coordinating committee provides administrative oversight for the project and that the report is a product of the ICC's Committee on Intersegmental Applications of Information Technology. The coordination team includes representatives from all three public higher education systems, the AICCU, and the Department of Education. He said students could use the system to apply for college admission and for financial aid. He said a related project is the California Student Information Services (CSIS).

Mr. Tansey said that Student Friendly Services provides a single point of entry for students and their families to get information online about California higher education.

He said it links separate education related sites and is geared to provide assistance and information to students beginning at a very early age and continuing through high school.

Mr. Tansey said that, among the more important features of the project, is the ability for students to develop a personal, confidential college admission/preparation portfolio. He said the intersegmental development process was valuable. He said the URL for the site is www.colleges.edu. He reviewed and gave examples of the project's different features, particularly the use of the individual student portfolio, unified application process, and student financial aid information. He said counselors and teachers could also use the site to gather accurate information – such as application deadlines — for students and themselves. He said the project target is to be fully operational by Fall 2000.

Chair Rodriguez questioned whether or not the project duplicates other initiatives and projects with similar objectives, including the Commission. He said he had long advocated, and believed the Roundtable was seeking, the development of a single application form for all California public higher education. He expressed hope that Student Friendly Services is not another California Virtual University in that it may fail to meet expectations.

Commission Vice Chair Arkatov asked how California could avoid another debacle like CVU. He asked how the project support will be continued and how the project will be marketed. He said Mr. Tansey was on the hot seat.

University of California representative Judith Ellis stated that, while the financing plan for the original concept of the California Virtual University did fail, the CVU continues to exist and provides an online listing of California higher education courses. She said information on the site is frequently updated and is accurate. She said the community

colleges are doing a good job maintaining expressed the belief that the project is not a debacle.

Commissioner Arkatov said that the failure of CVU had made California the laughing stock of the country. He said the project failed because the segments did not, rather than could not, fund the project.

There was a protracted conversation during which Commissioner Arkatov and Ms. Ellis debated the project cost, relative success of the CVC, and the reasons behind the project's lack of funding.

Committee Chair Chandler said the discussion had gotten off track and reminded the Commissioners that Chair Rodriguez's concern had been for duplication of effort.

Mr. Tansey responded that the Student Friendly Services had experienced very strong intersegmental cooperation and contribution of effort. He said that developing a unified higher education application is an admirable goal, but is not one of the charges for this project. He said students utilizing the project's features might produce a single portfolio to send along with applications.

Chair Rodriguez cited the success of a single application form for student financial aid as evidence the admission's application can also be integrated. He said he had cited the example of CVU to illustrate the issue of sustaining State funding over the long term. He reiterated concern for the potential of duplication of effort and expenditure by various State agencies. He said students and their families should not be victims of the whims of the State agencies; that a project should be able to stand the test of time.

Mr. Tansey said completing a college application is not the hard part of the process; the difficulty is getting students adequately prepared in order to take advantage of the existing options. He said that was the goal of Student Friendly Services. He said the original proposal was for a three-year effort. The project is going operational in the first year and will be updated in the second and third year.

Commissioner Chandler thanked Mr. Tansey and Mr. Fox for their presentation and urged them to keep working on collaboration with others, including the Commission, in providing information on the World Wide Web.

Executive Director Fox said the Commission has a role to play in providing information about higher education, but it does not have a role in taking applications. He suggested that work continue towards increased collaboration.

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Adjournment | Having no further business, Chair Chandler adjourned the committee meeting at 3:31 p.m. |
|--------------------|---|
